

Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 have all been addressed. If the Examiner does not agree, however, he is most courteously solicited to call the undersigned because it is believed that a telephone interview should resolve any open issues.

Turning now to the art rejection, Claim 1, the only independent claim in this application, and several of the dependent claims have been rejected on the combination of Uchiyama in view of Neumann. The Examiner has stated a reason why he believes this combination is obvious, but it is believed that the combination, which the Examiner is proposing is based upon Applicants' teaching and not the teaching of the prior art.

It is true that Uchiyama and Neumann both show laminated parts but the parts are not the same. The laminations in Uchiyama are for the core while the laminations in Neumann are for the magnets. Thus, if one were to follow Neumann's teaching in Uchiyama, one would substitute the magnets of Neumann for the magnets of Uchiyama and the resulting combination still would not meet the claim language. Therefore, it is believed that the Examiner should reconsider and withdraw this rejection because it is not based upon the teaching of the art, but rather upon Applicants' teaching.

Claim 3 has been rejected also on the basis that it would be obvious to utilize Neumann's motor structure in a generator. Again, however, it is submitted that the reference is designed for a synchronic motor and although the mechanisms may be similar, they are not totally interchangeable. Therefore, the Examiner is solicited to reconsider this rejection.

Claim 6 is also rejected on the combination on the basis that Uchiyama shows an insulating layer. Applicants' attorney has not found any statement in this reference that indicates that the plates are insulated from each other nor the recitation that the plates are coated. It would be appreciated if the Examiner could point out this to Applicants' attorney if he wishes to maintain this position. However, even if it is the case, the combination still does not teach the invention for the reasons set out above.

Claim 2 has been rejected on the combination in further view of Yamamoto. Yamamoto does show the feature called out in the dependent claim but it submitted that this combination again goes contrary to the teaching of the combination. In Neumann the plates are lined up with each other by the rods 17 and as such, if the references were combined as the Examiner has proposed, there would be no need for the Yamamoto construction.

Turning now to retained Claims 7, 9 and 10, the Examiner has rejected these claims on the combination of Uchiyama and Neumann in view of Miyao. However, it is submitted that the angular relationship defined in Miyao is different from that now clearly called out in the amended Claim 7 and therefore it is suggested that this rejection should also be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is most respectfully submitted that, pending the Examiner's decision regarding the drawing corrections, that this case is condition for favorable action and such action is most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ernest A. Beutler
Registration No: 19901
500 Newport Center Drive
Suite 945
Newport Beach, Ca 92660
(949) 717-4821 Pacific Time

- ✓ Proposed drawing corrections
- ✓ Proposed additional drawing

VERSION WITH MARKINGS SHOWING CHANGES MADE

Amend Claim 1 as follows:

1. (Amended) A rotating machine having a plurality of permanent magnets having [changing pluralities] alternating polarities in a circumferential direction at [regular] equally spaced intervals and a relatively rotatable associated element having a plurality of armatures around which coil windings are formed, the armatures are formed from a lamination of a plurality of electromagnetic steel plates each having a thickness in the range of 0.25-0.65mm.

Amend Claim 2 as follows:

2. (Amended) A rotating machine as set forth in claim 1 wherein the electromagnetic steel plates are interlocked relative to each other by series of partially punched openings forming holes and projections, which inter-fit with each other so as to line up the electromagnetic steel plates in relationship to each other and to provide a mechanical coupling there between.

Amend Claim 5 as follows:

5. (Amended) A rotating machine as set forth in claim 4 wherein the electromagnetic steel plate are interlocked relative to each other by series of partially punched openings forming holes and projections, which inter-fit with each other so as to line up the electromagnetic steel plates in relationship to each other and to provide a mechanical coupling there between, said [the] partially punched openings [forming holes and projections are] being provided in each tooth of the stator core.

Amend Claim 7 as follows:

7. (Amended) A rotating machine as set forth in claim 1 wherein the [magnet electrical angle of the poles of the permanent magnets is set with respect to the rotational axis to be] spacing of the poles of said permanent magnets and their number and the number and spacing of the coils being set so that if the degree of rotation during which each coil experiences a complete cycle of electrical current is taken as 360° the circumferential extent of each of the magnet poles (the magnet electrical angle) lies in [an electrical] the range of 120° to 140° of such relative rotation.

Cancel Claim 8 without prejudice.

Amend Claim 9 as follows:

9. (Amended) A rotating machine as set forth in claim [8] 7 wherein the machine comprises an electrical generator.